UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,828	09/22/2006	Kazuyoshi Toriyama	723-1984	4629

27562   7590   02/01/2011
NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER
ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/01/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/593,828	TORIYAMA, KAZUYOSHI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HENRY ORR	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 November 2010*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 11/16/2010.

2.   Claims 1-19 are pending in the case.

3.   Claim 19 is newly added.

4.   Claims 1, 4 and 12-19 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

5.   In Applicant's response dated 11/16/2010, applicant has amended the following:

a) Claims 1-18

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and

rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 8/17/2010 are withdrawn:

a) Objection to claim 4

b) 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd rejection to claims 4 and 18

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelsinger et al. (hereinafter "Gelsinger"), U.S. Patent No. 5,892,511 in view of Oran et al. (hereinafter "Oran"), U.S. Patent No. 5,757,371.**
Claim 1:

Gelsinger teaches **an information processing apparatus, comprising: a memory for storing data** (see col. 11 lines 60-65; memory and storage devices) **to display a plurality of windows** (see col. 5 lines 44-52; overlapping windows) **and data to display a plurality of selection areas which respectively correspond to said plurality of windows,** (see col. 5 lines 16-20; selectable icons or names in a typical taskbar are interpreted to be the recited "selection areas") **a display for including a first display area on which only a predetermined window out of the plurality of windows is displayed or the plurality of windows are displayed in an overlapping manner** (see col. 5 lines 44-52; overlapping windows) **and a second display area on which said plurality of selection areas are displayed, and a processor coupled to the memory, the memory storing instructions that, when executed by the processor, control the processor to:** (see col. 5 lines 16-20; selectable icons or names in a typical taskbar (i.e., second display area) are interpreted to be the recited "selection areas")

Gelsinger fails to expressly teach detecting an input to display positions of said plurality of selection areas.

However, Oran teaches an auto hide function for a taskbar having selectable icons or names (i.e., selection areas) that a user may cause to disappear and reappear (see col. 9 lines 10-28). **(claim 1; i.e., detect an input to display positions of said plurality of selection areas)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the taskbar bar as taught by Gelsinger to include an auto hide function as taught by Oran to provide the benefit of exploiting more of the available screen space (see Oran; col. 9 lines 15-17).

Gelsinger teaches **display, when it is determined that a first predetermined input is performed within a selection area corresponding to a window displayed on said first display area or a window displayed on a forefront by said detector, a window corresponding to the selection area that said detector detects as the first predetermined input on said second display area**(see col. 5 lines 16-20, col. 7 lines 1-7; selecting (i.e., first input) the icon (i.e., selection area) in a typical taskbar (i.e., display area underlying taskbar) to display a overlapped window in the forefront as the active window).

Claim 2:

Gelsinger teaches wherein the processor is further controlled to display**, when it is determined that a first predetermined input is performed within a selection area corresponding to a window which is not displayed on said first display area and**

said second display area or a window a part of which is hidden under the window

displayed on the forefront on said first display area, the window corresponding to

the selection area on said first display area or on the forefront on said first

display area (see col. 5 lines 16-20, col. 7 lines 1-7; selecting (i.e., first input) the icon

(i.e., selection area) in a typical taskbar (i.e., display area underlying taskbar) to display

a overlapped window in the forefront as the active window on the desktop (i.e., first

display area).

Claim 3:

Gelsinger teaches **wherein the processor is further controlled to display,**

when it is determined that a second predetermined input is performed within a

selection area corresponding to a window which is not displayed on said first

display area and said second display area or a window a part of which is hidden

under the window displayed on the forefront on said first display area, the

window corresponding to the selection area on said second display area (see col.

5 lines 16-20, col. 7 lines 1-7; selecting (i.e., second input) the icon (i.e., selection area)

in a typical taskbar (i.e., display area underlying taskbar) to display a overlapped

window in the forefront as the active window on the desktop (i.e., first display area).

Claim 4:

Gelsinger teaches **a memory for storing data** (see col. 11 lines 60-65; memory

and storage devices) **to display a plurality of windows** (see col. 5 lines 44-52;

overlapping windows) **and data to display a plurality of selection areas which**

respectively correspond to said plurality of windows, (see col. 5 lines 16-20;

selectable icons or names in a typical taskbar are interpreted to be the recited "selection

areas") **a display for including a first display area on which only a predetermined**

window out of the plurality of windows is displayed or said plurality of windows

are displayed in an overlapping manner (see col. 5 lines 44-52; overlapping

windows) **and a second display area on which said plurality of selection areas are**

displayed and a processor coupled to the memory, the memory storing

instructions that, when executed by the processor, control the processor to: (see

col. 5 lines 16-20; selectable icons or names in a typical taskbar (i.e., display area

underlying taskbar) are interpreted to be the recited "selection areas")

Gelsinger fails to expressly teach detecting an input to display positions of said

plurality of selection areas.

However, Oran teaches an auto hide function for a taskbar having selectable

icons or names (i.e., selection areas) that a user may cause to disappear and reappear

(see col. 9 lines 10-28). **(claim 4; i.e., detect an input to display positions of said**

plurality of selection areas)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the taskbar bar as taught by Gelsinger to include an auto

hide function as taught by Oran to provide the benefit of exploiting more of the available

screen space (see Oran; col. 9 lines 15-17).

Gelsinger teaches **display, when it is determined that a second predetermined input is performed at a display position of a selection area corresponding to a window which is not displayed on said first display area and said second display area or a window a part of which is hidden under a forefront window out the plurality of windows displayed in the overlapping manners on said first display area, a window corresponding to the selection area that is detected as a first predetermined input on said second display area** (see col. 5 lines 16-20, col. 7 lines 1-7; selecting (i.e., second input) the icon (i.e., selection area) in a typical taskbar (i.e., display area underlying taskbar) to display a overlapped window in the forefront as the active window on the desktop (i.e., first display area).

Claim 5:

Gelsinger teaches **wherein the processor is further controlled to display, when it is determined that the first predetermined input is performed within a selection area corresponding to a window displayed on said first display area or the window displayed on the forefront, the window corresponding to the selection area on said second display area** (see col. 5 lines 16-20, col. 7 lines 1-7; selecting (i.e., first input) the icon (i.e., selection area) in a typical taskbar (i.e., display area underlying taskbar) to display a overlapped window in the forefront as the active window on the desktop (i.e., first display area).

Claim 6:

Gelsinger fails to expressly teach detecting an input to an arbitrary position of said second display area.

However, Oran teaches a remove able taskbar which may expose a second display area allowing a user to right click at any arbitrary position (see col. 9 lines 10-28). Oran further teaches windows to occupy the desktop space where the taskbar used to be (see Oran; col. 9 lines 15-17). **(claim 6; i.e., wherein the processor is further controlled to: detect an input to an arbitrary position of said second display area,** (e.g., right clicking on a desktop where taskbar used to be) **set, when a window is displayed on said second display area, the window to an inputable state** (e.g., removing taskbar and making a window active in the area where the taskbar used to be))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the taskbar bar as taught by Gelsinger to include an auto hide function as taught by Oran to provide the benefit of exploiting more of the available screen space (see Oran; col. 9 lines 15-17).

Claim 7:

Gelsinger teaches **wherein the processor is further controlled to display, when it is determined that a predetermined input is performed within a selection**

area corresponding to the window displayed on said second display area, the

window corresponding to the selection area of the forefront on said first display

area (see col. 5 lines 16-20, col. 7 lines 1-7; selecting (i.e., input) the icon (i.e., selection

area) in a typical taskbar (i.e., display area underlying taskbar) to display a overlapped

window in the forefront as the active window on the desktop (i.e., first display area).

Claim 8:

Gelsinger fails to expressly teach window displayed on said second display area.

However, Oran teaches a remove able taskbar which may expose a second

display area which allows windows to occupy the desktop space (i.e., second display

area) where the taskbar used to be (see Oran; col. 9 lines 15-17). **(claim 8; i.e.,**

wherein the processor is further controlled to display, in a case that said window

is displayed on said second display area and when it is determined that other

window is being displayed on said second display area, the other window on the

forefront on said first display area (see removing taskbar and making a window

active in the area where the taskbar used to be amongst other overlapped windows).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the taskbar bar as taught by Gelsinger to include an auto

hide function as taught by Oran to provide the benefit of exploiting more of the available

screen space (see Oran; col. 9 lines 15-17).

Claim 10:

Gelsinger teaches displaying a taskbar (i.e., a basic input window) **(claim 10;**

i.e., wherein said memory stores data to display a basic input window to be

displayed on said second display area, and the processor is further controlled to

display said basic input window on said second display area when no window to

be displayed on said second display area is present).

Claim 11:

Gelsinger fails to expressly teach window displayed on said second display area.

However, Oran teaches a remove able taskbar which may expose a second

display area which allows windows to occupy the desktop space (i.e., second display

area) where the taskbar used to be (see Oran; col. 9 lines 15-17). A user may generate

new windows from existing windows.

(claim 11; i.e., wherein the processor is further controlled, when a

predetermined coordinates input is performed to said window displayed on said

second display area, generate data to display a new window and data to display a

new selection area, and store the generated data in said memory by bringing the

data to display a new window and the data to display a new selection area into

correspondence with each other, and the processor is further controlled to

display said generated selection area generated by said on said second display

area)

Claim 12:

Claim 12 is substantially encompassed in claim 1; therefore the claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claim 13:

Claim 13 is substantially encompassed in claim 1; therefore the claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claim 14:

Claim 14 is substantially encompassed in claim 1; therefore the claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claim 15:

Claim 14 is substantially encompassed in claim 4; therefore the claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4 above.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 is substantially encompassed in claim 4; therefore the claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4 above.

Claim 17:

Claim 17 is substantially encompassed in claim 1; therefore the claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claim 18:

Claim 18 is substantially encompassed in claim 1; therefore the claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claim 19:

Claim 19 is substantially encompassed in claim 1; therefore the claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

8.   **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelsinger in view of Oran as cited above, in further view of Shields et al. (hereinafter "Shields"), U.S. Patent No. 5,910,802 A.**

Claim 9:

Both Gelsinger and Oran fail to expressly teach a touch panel.

However, Shields teaches a touch sensitive border and a viewing area (see abstract, Figure 4). **(claim 9; i.e., wherein the processor is further controlled to detect said first predetermined input on the basis of the input data from a touch**

panel which is not set on said first display area but set is on said second display

area)

It would have be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the taskbar as taught by Gelsinger in view of Oran to

accept input via touch sensitive border as taught by Shields to provide the benefit of

providing another way of auto hiding the taskbar to take advantage of limited screen

space (see Shields; col. 1 line 35).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/2010 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Gelsinger does not disclose displaying a window

corresponding to the selection area on the second display area (see Gelsinger; page

12).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Gelsinger teaches a taskbar on a display area (i.e., second display area) (see

Figure 4). Examiner submits that the minimized window icons (i.e., selection area)

within the task bar may be selected to display a corresponding window (i.e., restoring

the window to the original display size). In other words, selecting on the window icon

may restore a minimized window to the most recent display size before the window was

minimized. Therefore, Gelsinger does teach or suggest displaying a window

corresponding to the selection area on the second display area.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Examiner maintains prior art rejections.

Conclusion

1.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HENRY ORR whose telephone number is (571)270-

1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William L. Bashore can be reached on (571) 272-4088. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1/16/2011
HO

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178